



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,292	01/23/2002	Michael J. Dove		5818
7590	04/19/2005		EXAMINER	
Michael J. Dove 24115 Lindley Street Mission Viejo, CA 92691			WILLIAMS, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3676	
DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/053,292	DOVE, MICHAEL J.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mark A. Williams	3676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/24/05.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 5-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 5-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, line 7, “an existing pole segment” is indefinite in that it is not clear if this is intended to refer to an identical pole segment, as based on the preamble.

In claim 9, line 8, “an extension pole assembly” renders the claim indefinite since it is not clear how an invention can encompass one of it self, in the context of the claims (see preamble). This is true also in claim 13.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eichhorn, US Patent 5,779,386 or Schroeder, US Patent 3,091,790. In each of Eichhorn and Schroeder, an extension pole arrangement comprising at least one pole segment, each pole segment being substantially identical (relatively identical) and comprising first and second tube portions, said first portion of a given diameter and extending longitudinally from said second portion and terminating with an open end; said second tube portion having an open end with an inside diameter greater than the outside diameter of said first tube portion, and configured for receiving the first tube portion of an existing pole segment; said first tube portion including a locking mechanism configured for contacting mating engagement with an aperture in said second tube portion for receiving said locking mechanism; whereby said substantially identical pole segments are conjoinable.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Eichhorn or Schroeder, in view of Ross, US Patent 5,029,847. Neither of Eichhorn or Schroeder teach (1) the second tube portion being of substantial reduced length compared to the first, and (2) the protective cap means, as claimed.

Regarding (1), it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the assembly of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47. Such a modification would produce no unexpected results and is not critical to the design.

Regarding (2), Ross provides such a compressible cap insert means at 34. The examiner servers Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of tubular structures to use such cap means for both visual attractiveness, as well as to provide a protected end. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one skilled in the art to have included in the design of either of Eichhorn or Schroeder such a modification, as generally taught in Ross, for the purpose of both visual attractiveness, as well as to provide a protected end.

1/24/05  
7. Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Schroeder does not show a plurality of pole segments configured substantially the same. It is the position of the examiner that the claims of record do not adequately establish the degree of sameness of such a plurality of poles. The poles of the applied are at least substantially similar since the relative structure of the poles shown are the same.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

This action is non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Williams whose telephone number is (703) 305-3438. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Williams

4/14/05



Suzanne Dino Barrett  
Primary Examiner